THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.14345 of 2007

Dated:11.07.2007

Between:

Sahebzadi Intikhab Jehan Begum Saheba, D/o.Late Nawab Basheer Jung,
And others.

…Petitioners

and

The Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District,
And another.

…Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.14345 of 2007

ORDER:

Petitioners 1 to 3 are represented by one Sri Chowdary M.A.Haseeb. They filed the instant Writ Petition assailing Memo No.LP1/7673/97, dated 18.06.2007, issued by the first respondent rejecting the request of the petitioners to make entries/grant mutation in respect of the land in Survey No.101 situated at Miyapur Village and further requesting the first respondent to direct the second respondent to conduct *de novo* enquiry afresh.

It is the case of the petitioners that Smt.Basheerunnisa Begum, W/o.Nawab Basheer Jung, was pattadar of the land in Survey No.101 including Survey No.101/A. The petitioners claim to be scions of Nawab Basheer Jung and Basheerunnisa Begum. After the death of their mother, the petitioners filed an application to mutate their names in the revenue records. By order, dated 10.06.1990, the second respondent, however, ordered to incorporate the names of Chalasani Nagabhushanam and others. The first respondent set aside the said order and remanded the matter to the Tahasildar. At that stage, it appears, some of the third parties filed Land Grabbing Cases under the Andhra Pradesh Land Grabbing (Prohibition) Act, 1982, being LGC Nos.131 and 136 of 1995. The Special Court declared the land as Government land. The same was confirmed by this Court, against which, SLP is preferred. The Supreme Court ordered *status quo* on 25.08.2003.

When the petitioners' General Power of Attorney holder approached the first respondent for necessary mutation in respect of their share in the property in Survey No.101, the first respondent issued the impugned memo expressing his inability to accede to the request of the petitioners on the ground that the Supreme Court granted order of *status quo* in SLP No.14917 of 2003 and batch.

After hearing the learned Counsel for the petitioners and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (General-T), this Court is not able to accept the submission of the learned Counsel for the petitioners that as the Supreme Court

only ordered *status quo* regarding possession, the petitioners are entitled for mutation proceedings. In the background of the facts, even if the Supreme Court ordered *status quo* as to possession, this Court does not find any infirmity in the first respondent rejecting the claim for mutation.

The Writ Petition is misconceived, and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

11.07.2007
vs